

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-18 are pending in the present application. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 9 and 11-14 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the remaining claims in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner indicated that the IDS filed on December 6, 2007 failed to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document and each non-patent literature publication.

Applicant's attorney appreciates the Examiner speaking with him on May 7, 2008 regarding the IDS filed on December 6, 2007 wherein the Examiner indicated that the references cited in the IDS would be considered if a Supplemental IDS was filed that includes copies of the foreign patent documents and non-patent literature publications. Accordingly, applicant is submitting a Supplemental IDS with this response document that includes copies of the foreign patent documents and non-patent literature publications cited in the IDS of December 6, 2007.

Claims 1, 3, 6, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based on Qin et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,620).

Referring to Qin et al., the reference is directed to a sensor validation apparatus. The reference, however, does not provide any teaching of: "generating a first message containing a first software variable having a first site-specific value that is transmitted from the first computer to the second computer, the first site-specific value indicative of whether one of a fault event, a maintenance event, or a calibration event associated with the first computer has occurred", as recited in claim 1. In contrast, Qin et al. discloses a sensor validator 100 that has eight

computational units implemented on a single computer. See Qin et al., column 5, lines 12-16 and Figure 11.

Further, Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: "receiving the first message at the second computer, the second computer storing the first site-specific value in a first record of a first database, the first record being associated with the first software variable", as recited in claim 1. In contrast, as described above, Qin et al. discloses a sensor validator 100 on a single computer. See Qin et al., column 5, lines 12-16 and Figure 11.

Further, Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: "code for determining whether the first site-specific value is equal to a site-specific event indicator value indicative of an occurrence of an event", as recited in claim 1. In contrast, the reference discloses: "A Detection Unit ... compares the detection index to detection threshold 144. If the detection index exceeds the detection threshold, then a detection event 148 is generated. See Qin et al., column 5, lines 52-54. In other words, Qin et al. does not determine whether a first site-specific value is equal to the site-specific event indicator value.

Further, Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: "if the first site-specific value is equal to the site-specific event indicator value then generating a second software variable having both a first predetermined name and a value equal to a first standardized value indicating that an event has occurred", as recited in claim 1. In contrast, the reference discloses: "A Detection Unit ... compares the detection index to detection threshold 144. If the detection index exceeds the detection threshold, then a detection event 148 is generated. See Qin et al., column 5, lines 52-57.

Further, Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: "generating a third software variable having both the first predetermined name and a value equal to a second standardized value indicating that an event has not occurred", as recited in claim 1. Applicant notes that Qin et al. does not mention standardized values.

Because Qin et al. does not teach each every limitation of independent claim 1, and claims

3 and 6 which depend from claim 1, applicant submits that claims 1, 3 and 6 are allowable over this reference.

Referring to claim 15, Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: "code for generating a first message containing a first software variable having a first site-specific value that is transmitted from the first computer to the second computer, the first site-specific value indicative of whether one of a fault event, a maintenance event, or a calibration event associated with the first computer has occurred", as recited in claim 15. In contrast, Qin discloses a sensor validator 100 that has eight computational units implemented on a single computer. See Qin et al., column 5, lines 12-16 and Figure 11.

Further, Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: "code for receiving the first message at the second computer and storing the first site-specific value in a first record of a first database, the first record being associated with the first software variable", as recited in claim 15.

Further, Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: "code for determining whether the first site-specific value is equal to a site-specific event indicator value indicative of an occurrence of an event", as recited in claim 15. In contrast, the reference discloses: "A Detection Unit ... compares the detection index to detection threshold 144. If the detection index exceeds the detection threshold, then a detection event 148 is generated. See Qin et al., column 5, lines 52-54. In other words, Qin et al. does not determine whether a first site-specific value is equal to the site-specific event indicator value.

Further, Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: "code for generating a second software variable having both a first predetermined name and a value equal to a first standardized value indicating that an event has occurred, if the first site-specific value is equal to the site-specific event indicator value", as recited in claim 15. In contrast, the reference discloses: "A Detection Unit ... compares the detection index to detection threshold 144. If the detection index exceeds the detection threshold, then a detection event 148 is generated. See Qin et al., column 5, lines 52-57.

Further, Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: "code for generating a third software variable having both the first predetermined name and a value equal to a second standardized value indicating that an event has not occurred", as recited in claim 15. Applicant notes that Qin et al. does not mention standardized values.

Because Qin et al. does not teach each every limitation of independent claim 15, and claim 16 which depends from claim 15, applicant submits that claims 15 and 16 are allowable over this reference.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on Qin et al. and Almstead et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,499,114. Claim 7 depends from independent claim 1 and therefore incorporates all of the limitations of claim 1.

In particular, Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: Further, the reference does not provide any teaching of: "if the first site-specific value is equal to the site-specific event indicator value then generating a second software variable having both a first predetermined name and a value equal to a first standardized value indicating that an event has occurred", as recited in claims 1 and 7. In contrast, Qin et al.: "A Detection Unit ... compares the detection index to detection threshold 144. If the detection index exceeds the detection threshold, then a detection event 148 is generated. See Qin et al., column 5, lines 52-57. Further, Almstead et al. does not provide any teaching of the foregoing limitations of claim 1 and 7.

Further, the Qin et al. does not provide any teaching of: "generating a third software variable having both the first predetermined name and a value equal to a second standardized value indicating that an event has not occurred.", as recited in claims 1 and 7. Further, Almstead et al. does not provide any teaching of the foregoing limitations of claims 1 and 7.

Further, after reviewing Almstead et al., column 8, lines 13-19 as identified by the Examiner, applicant was not able to find any teaching of a first software variable having a site-

specific software variable name, as recited in claim 7.

Because the combination of Qin et al. and Almstead et al. does not teach each every limitation of independent claim 1, and claim 7 which depends from claim 1, applicant submits that claim 7 is allowable over these references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Such action is most earnestly solicited. If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with applicant's attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below for an interview.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /John F. Buckert/
John F. Buckert
Reg. No. 44,572
Telephone: (248) 524-2300 ext. 3109

Date: May 8, 2008